

**REMARKS**

This case has been carefully reviewed and analyzed in view of the outstanding Office Action dated March 24, 2006.

The Examiner has rejected claims 1-6 under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. Claims 1-6 have been canceled and replaced with new claims 7-12 in order to overcome the rejection.

Moreover, the Examiner has rejected claims 1-6 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wilford, USP 3,351,691 in view of Gill, USP 6,886,807. Nevertheless, it is respectfully requested that the rejection be withdrawn in light of the following reasons.

Wilford, USP 3,351,691, the first reference cited by the Examiner, discloses a nozzle assembly and method of molding same which comprises the steps of: (1) manufacturing the inserts in predetermined spaced relationship in a mold; (2) introducing molding material into the mold at the axis of the nozzle and thence flowing same outwardly in all radial directions through a space so shaped to form the transverse diaphragm and axially located in alignment with the inner end face of the first annular insert, and thence flowing same in opposite axial directions toward both inserts including flowing into a space surrounding the first insert; (3) simultaneously applying heat and appreciable pressure to the mold material to harden same and molding bond same to the insert; (4) remove the composite article from the mold; (5) machining the inner surface of the first annular insert to a shape forming a continuation of the conical surface. Nevertheless, this reference fails to disclose a method for manufacturing a soft nozzle having a preferred open status, comprising steps of: mounting a threaded cover having interior threads onto a bottom step of a first mold post; disposing at least a pair of combinative blocks in a coupler at a top of

the first mold post; disposing the first mold post composed of a threaded cover and the combinative blocks into a mother mold; disposing a second mold post into the other end of the mother mold such that the second mold post and the first mold post would oppose to each other, and tops thereof would keep a distance from each other; injecting soft plastic material into a sprue of the mother mold, and integrally combining the threaded cover and the combinative blocks via hot melting, thereby accomplishing a nozzle, a front of which is integrally combined with a binding cover; and cutting on spaced surface of the front end of the nozzle to form at least one outlet crevice, which is vertically formed between the combinative blocks at right and left sides of the nozzle. Hence, this reference can be clearly distinguished from the present invention.

Gill, USP 6,886,807, the second reference cited by the Examiner, discloses a bite valve for drinking with integral spring which comprises: a hollow deformable impervious body having a receiving opening fluidically connectable to an outlet of the hydration system for receiving liquids and a dispensing opening adapted to selectively dispense received liquids; a resilient piston positioned within the hollow deformable body, the resilient piston comprising a plug normally blocking the dispensing opening, and a resilient bifurcated member having longitudinal dimension and lateral dimension, adapted to shorten its initial predetermined longitudinal dimension when a lateral force is exerted on its lateral dimension, and regain its initial longitudinal dimension when the lateral force is not exerted; a restraining member is provided inside the body, limiting the biting portion of the valve to a portion near the dispensing opening, thus facilitating better performance of the valve, whereby when a lateral force is exerted on the resilient bifurcated member the piston is retracted inwardly thus allowing liquid to flow through the dispensing opening. Similarly, this reference also fails to teach or suggest a method for manufacturing a

soft nozzle having a preferred open status as claimed in claim 7. It is obvious that this reference fails to remedy the deficiency of the Wilford reference. Consequently, this reference is in no way similar to the present invention.

Moreover, the method for manufacturing a soft nozzle having a preferred open status according to the invention has the following advantages over the prior art:

1. The threaded cover and combinative blocks mounted on the mobile mold posts can easily combine with the soft plastic material to form an integrity after the step of plastic injection.
2. The integrally formed nozzle is a single element, which need not be assembled by a number of elements, as is the prior art. Therefore, the manufacture procedure and costs can be efficiently reduced, and the tightness of the combination of the nozzle to the water bag can be increased.
3. There is an appropriate distance is provided between the first mold post and the second mold post. While injecting soft plastic material and forming a pattern, a binding cover will extend from the rim of the front end of the nozzle and can be turned over to tightly bind the front end of the nozzle, in order to increase the tightness of the outlet crevice and prevent the liquid form leaking out of the water bag.
4. The combinative blocks are integrally combined to the two sides of the interior flow path of the nozzle, such that when the nozzle is bitted, the sinking distance would effectively be controlled to keep the interior flow path impeded.

Accordingly, even if the disclosures of the cited references are combined together, the combined disclosure still fails to teach a method for manufacturing a soft nozzle having a preferred open status as claimed in new claim 7. It is undoubtedly that this characteristic of the present invention involves the inventive step required by the Patent Law. In other words, the combined disclosure of the

cited reference still fails to teach each and every element of the claimed invention and so the subject matter sought to be patented as a whole would not have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art.

The applicant has reviewed the prior art as cited by the Examiner but not used in the rejection and believes that the new claims clearly and distinctly patentably define over such prior art.

It is now believed that the subject Patent Application has been placed in condition of allowance, and such action is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,



Signature

Leong C. Lei

Registration No. 50402

June 24, 2006